IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

FRIDAY, THE 25TH MAY 2007 / 4TH JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 15714 of 2007(U)

PETITIONERS:

----

1. **K.ABRAHAM, WORKER GRADE I, SECTION NO.3/2, KIP RB SUB DIVISION NO.2, THENMALA, KOLLAM DIST.**

2. **V.K.GEORGE, WORKER GRADE I, KIP RB STORE SECTION 1/3., WORKSHOP SUB DIVISION, THENMALA , KOLLAM DISTRICT.**

3. **G.SOMAN PILLAI, WORKER GRADE I, SUB DIVISION 2, KIP RB SECTION NO.1/2., THENMALA , KOLLAM DISTRICT.**

4. **V.SASIDHARAN, WORKER GRADE I, MECHANICAL SECTION NO.3/3, SUB DIVISION NO.3., KIP RB THENMALA, KOLLAM DISTRICT**

BY ADV. SRI.PIRAPPANCODE V.SREEDHARAN NAIR

RESPONDENT:

STATE OF KERALA REP.BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.BIJOY CHANDRAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 25/05/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

W.P.(C) No.15714 of 2007-U

Dated this the 25th day of May, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The petitioners were CLR workers who were regularised in service on 20-1-1990, 1-8-1992, 1-8-1992 and 2-11-1998 respectively. They claim they have several years of CLR service. Those service was reckoned while granting higher grade also. But, the same is not taken into account while granting increments. So, they submitted a representation before the Government praying that increments may be granted to them taking into account their CLR service also. The said representation was rejected by the Government by Ext.P3 communication stating that as per the existing rules there is no provision to reckon/count the CLR service prior to their regularisation as qualifying service for the purpose of annual increments. This writ petition is filed challenging Ext.P3. The petitioners have not pointed out any rule or order which enables them to get the benefit of counting CLR service for the purpose of annual increment. Therefore, I find nothing illegal with Ext.P3. Accordingly,

the writ petition fails, and it is dismissed.

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, JUDGE.

MS